

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 9, 2003 (Paper No. 2). Claims 1 to 21 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 9, 17, 19, 20 and 21 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,608,545 (Kagawa) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,510 (Beukema). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kagawa in view of Beukema, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,255,312 (Koshiishi). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kagawa, Beukema, and Koshiishi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,148,470 (Kobayashi). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kagawa in view of Beukema, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,195 (Leung). Claims 9 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kagawa in view of Beukema, and further in view of Koshiishi, Kobayashi, and Leung. Claims 17 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kagawa in view of Beukema, and further in view of Leung. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a communication system that utilizes a first communication apparatus capable of speech communication via a first communication line and a second communication apparatus capable of speech communication via the first communication line or a second communication line. The first and second communication apparatuses are connectable with each other, and a judgment is made on the connection status between the first and second communication apparatuses. Based on the judgment,

the present invention switches the speech communication between first speech communication via the first communication line by a first speech means and second speech communication via the first communication line by a second speech means.

With specific reference to the claims, independent Claim 1 recites a communication system having a first communication apparatus capable of a first speech communication via a first communication line and a second communication apparatus capable of a second speech communication via the first communication line or a second communication line. The communication system comprises first speech means provided for the first communication apparatus for performing the first speech communication and second speech means provided for the second communication apparatus for performing the second speech communication. The communication system also comprises judging means for judging a connection status between the first communication apparatus and the second communication apparatus. The communication system further comprises switching means for switching a speech communication between the first speech communication via the first communication line by the first speech means and the second speech communication via the first communication line by the second speech means, in accordance with a judgment by the judging means.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 are apparatus claims that correspond generally to Claim 1. Independent Claims 19 to 21 are method claims that correspond generally to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 19, 20 and 21, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least

the feature of switching a speech communication between the first speech communication via the first communication line by the first speech means and the second speech communication via the first communication line by the second speech means, in accordance with a judgment of connection status between the first and second communication apparatuses.

Kagawa relates to a facsimile device and communication control method. Kagawa discloses that portable telephone 102 is connected to a facsimile machine 101 (Figure 1). Kagawa also discloses that when the portable telephone is turned on it sends a connection check signal to peripheral devices connected via the cable (column 8, lines 10-19). The Office Action takes the position that Kagawa discloses a switch 216 for selectively connecting to microphone 112 of the portable telephone, or selectively connecting to the facsimile device 101 at pin6/pin7 of connectors 114/115 (column 5, lines 31-48). However, Kagawa makes no suggestion that switch 216 operates in accordance with the connection check signal, muchless in accordance with a judgment of connection status between telephone 102 and facsimile machine 101.

The Office Action further contends that Kagawa discloses selectively switching the first line between first input means and second input means in accordance with a judgment means. Specifically, the Office Action refers to claim 1 of Kagawa which recites

“control means, connected to the voltage detecting means and the connection verification means, for providing controls to inhibit facsimile communication depending on a voltage detected by said voltage detecting means upon a positive result from the connection check procedure performed by the

connection verification means which indicates that the facsimile device is properly connected to and communicating with the portable telephone.”

Kagawa indicates that the control means can inhibit facsimile communication, but makes no mention of switching a speech communication.

As such, Kagawa is not seen to teach or suggest switching a speech communication between first speech communication via a first communication line by first speech means and second speech communication via a first communication line by second speech means, in accordance with a judgment of connection status between first and second communication apparatuses.

The remaining art applied against the claims, namely Beukema, Kobayashi, Koshiishi, and Leung, is not seen to supply what is missing from Kagawa. Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 19, 20 and 21 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 74438 v 1